UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,945	09/29/2003	Sandro Pasquali	65164/P006C1C2C1/10606085	1566

29053 7590 01/08/2007

DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER	
PAULA, CESAR B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,945	PASQUALI, SANDRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/25/2006.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-47 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 19, 30 and 40 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged based on application #s 09/34,297, filed on **1/21/1999**, 09/843,130, filed on 4/26/2001, and 10/252,907, filed on 9/23/2002.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 9/29/2003 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Specification

5. The abstract has been appropriately amended, therefore its objection has been withdrawn.

6. The specification has been appropriately amended to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 09/234,297, filed on 1/21/1999, 09/843,130, filed on 4/26/2001, and 10/252,907, filed on 9/23/2002, therefore its objection has been withdrawn.

Double Patenting

7. The rejections of claims 1-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11, 1, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, and 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2,** that of claims (6 –attributes-- and 16--attribute), 16, 16, 16, 10-11, 16, 16, 16, 16, 5, 1, 1, 3, 16, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, and 1, of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,535,882 B2, hereinafter 882**, claims 1-13, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, 1, and 11 of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,272,493 B1, hereinafter 493**, have been withdrawn due to the similarity, but not equality in the both the instant application and the claims in the patents above.

8. The rejections of claims 1-47 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable based on similar grounds as those of claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over U.S. Patent No. **6,321,209 B1, hereinafter 209**, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the terminal disclaimer filed on 7/6/2006

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, except for claims 45-46 directed towards claims 5-8 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,636,856 B2, hereinafter 856**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

11. Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 13-23, 25, 29-34, 40, 43, and 47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims, 1, 1, 1, 17, 1, 18, 13, 1, 1, 1-5, 7, 18, 13, 1-5, 1, 1, and 13 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,434,563 B1, hereinafter 563**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 563 patent.

12. Claims 1-11, and 14-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 1, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, and 1 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2.** Although the conflicting claims are not

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 419 patent.

13. Claims 1-11, 14-18, 19-29, 30-39, and 40-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims (6 –attributes-- and 16--attribute), 16, 16, 16, 10-11, 16, 16, 16, 16, 5, 1, 1, 3, 16, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, and 1, respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,535,882 B2, hereinafter 882**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 882 patent.

14. Claims 1-43, and 46-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, 1, and 11 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,272,493 B1, hereinafter 493**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

15. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, except for claims 45-46, which are directed towards claims 5-8 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,636,856 B2, hereinafter 856**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

16. Claims 12-13, and 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2,** hereinafter 419, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, 419 fails to teach *the window object is a tiled window object.* Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, 419 fails to teach *the window object is a draggable window object.* Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 419 fails to teach *instructions are HTML.* Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame

windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 419 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

17. Claims 12-13, and 44-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of **882,** in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, 882 fails to teach *the window object is a tiled window object*. Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, 882 fails to teach *the window object is a draggable window object*. Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instructions are HTML*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in

new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instruction package is received by said client system and the web browser client after the web browser client accesses a web site via the electronic data network, said web site serving said instruction package.* Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instruction package is intended to be served to said client over the Internet.* Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

18. Claims 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of **493,** in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 493 fails to teach *instructions are HTML*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 493, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 493 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 493, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

19. Claims 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of **493,** in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

20. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 2 of U.S. Application No. **09/838,927, hereinafter 927**, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

21. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 2 of U.S. Application No. **09/859,928, hereinafter 928**, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

22. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 6 of U.S. Application No. **10/175,675, hereinafter 675**, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

23. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 6 of U.S. Application No. **11/188,764, hereinafter 764**, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

24. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

25. Claims 1-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding independent claim 1, Javascript discloses a server sending back to a browser, the contents of a web page, which includes a script (page 11, listing 1.2)-- *a server system configured to transmit a software system and associated content via an electronic data network; and a web browser client operating within a data processing system that is coupled to said*

server system via the electronic data network and having a content manifestation environment, said web browser client operative to receive said software system and said associated content via said server system.

Furthermore, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *to process said software system and said associated content to produce at least one window object within said content manifestation environment, said at least one window object associated with a set of controllable attributes and configured to manifest at least a portion of said associated content therein, said controllable attributes configured to affect manifestation of said at least one window object by said web browser client within said content manifestation environment..*

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using the script (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *window object executes within said web browser client which operates within said data processing system.*

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using the script (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *window object executes within said web browser client which operates within said data processing system.*

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using an entered url (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses replacing ads every few seconds on a browser window (pages 227-229).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses replacing—*not refreshed within client*-- ads every few seconds on a browser window (pages 227-229).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses moving the dividing lines of frames within a web browser (page 173, parag.1).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses resizing frames within a web browser (page 173, parag.1).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a minimize button for minimizing frames within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a maximize button for maximizing frames within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using an entered url—*over the Internet* (page 10, last parag. page 11).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Claim 14-15 are directed towards a network client for implementing the system found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser of the document received from the web server. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Claims 19-29 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-11 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 30-39 are directed towards a network client for implementing the system found in claims 1-10 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 40-42 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1, 6, and 6, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 43, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser-- *content manifestation environment corresponds to a screen environment maintained by said client system* (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server-- *instruction package is received by said client system and the web browser client after the web browser client accesses a web site via the electronic data network, said web site serving said instruction package* (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server—*said instruction package is intended to be served to said client system via the Internet* (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2).

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant states that the double patenting rejections are moot in view of the

terminal disclaimer filed on 7/6/2006 (pages 19-20). The Examiner disagrees, because the terminal disclaimer only disclaims part of the claims for patents 419,882, and 493.

Regarding claims 1-47, the Applicant notes that the Javascript in Lemay does not result In producing the window object with the manifestation environment (pages 21-23). The Examiner disagrees, because the browser displayed on a computer screen contains a least one frame window object (page 172, fig.9.1).

Conclusion

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The

Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/4/07